

EXHIBIT A

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
NORTHERN DIVISION**

MISSISSIPPI STATE CONFERENCE OF THE
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE
ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE; DR.
ANDREA WESLEY; DR. JOSEPH WESLEY;
ROBERT EVANS; GARY FREDERICKS;
PAMELA HAMNER; BARBARA FINN; OTHO
BARNES; SHIRLINDA ROBERTSON; SANDRA
SMITH; DEBORAH HULITT; RODESTA
TUMBLIN; DR. KIA JONES; MARCELEAN
ARRINGTON; VICTORIA ROBERTSON,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

STATE BOARD OF ELECTION
COMMISSIONERS; TATE REEVES, *in his official
capacity as Governor of Mississippi*; LYNN FITCH,
*in her official capacity as Attorney General of
Mississippi*; MICHAEL WATSON, *in his official
capacity as Secretary of State of Mississippi*,

Defendants,

AND

MISSISSIPPI REPUBLICAN EXECUTIVE
COMMITTEE,

Intervenor-Defendant.

**CIVIL ACTION NO.
3:22-cv-734-DPJ-HSO-LHS**

RESPONSIVE EXPERT REPORT OF DR. LISA HANDLEY

I submitted a remedial report in this case dated March 14, 2025 evaluating Black voters' opportunities to elect candidates of choice under the Mississippi Legislature's recently enacted Remedial Senate and House Plans as well as alternative remedial plans offered by the Plaintiffs. I have been asked by Plaintiffs to review the recently submitted responsive report of Defendants' expert Dr. Alford entitled *Declaration of John R. Alford, Ph.D.*, dated March 25, 2025. The following is my response to Dr. Alford's report.

Realistic Opportunity to Elect. Regarding my use of the “percent won” score as one metric for measuring opportunity for Black voters, Dr. Alford appears (on pages 3 and 4 of his report) to take issue with my opinion from my initial remedial report that “a percent won score of less than 60% can indicate that the district is not likely to provide Black voters with a realistic opportunity to elect their candidates of choice.” My use of the term “realistic opportunity to elect” is not novel – I have long distinguished districts that provide minority voters with a numerically equal chance to elect candidates of choice according to any particular effectiveness metric from districts that provide minority voters with a *realistic opportunity* to elect candidates of choice. For an example of this, see my 2001 co-authored *North Carolina Law Review* article “Drawing Effective Minority Districts: A Conceptual Framework and Some Empirical Evidence.”¹ The article was cited favorably by the U.S. Supreme Court in *Georgia v. Ashcroft*, 539 U.S. 461, 483 (2003).

¹ See Bernard Grofman, Lisa Handley, and David Lublin, “Drawing Effective Minority Districts: A Conceptual Framework and Some Empirical Evidence,” 79 North Carolina L. Rev. 1383 (2001). As we explained in the article, drawing “coin-flip” districts that are just over 50% effective may not, in the context of a districting plan as a whole, satisfy the requirement of equal opportunity under the Voting Rights Act:

If a legislature in a 10% black state drew one hundred districts, ten of which barely met this de minimis percentage, and the remainder of which gave African Americans essentially no chance of electing their chosen candidate, the result would be ninety districts in which minority candidates had virtually no chance of getting elected and ten districts in which minority candidates had no better than a fifty-fifty chance of getting elected-and in a bad year, an all-white legislature might be elected. Such a plan is unlikely to satisfy the Voting Rights Act, as properly interpreted.

Id. at 1424.

While this potential distinction between numerically “effective” districts and realistic opportunity districts did not come up during the Louisiana trial mentioned by Dr. Alford in his report (the *Nairne* case), it was discussed in my deposition in that case. Importantly, in *Nairne*, there were no instances of adopted or proposed districts in Louisiana falling within the range of 50% to 60% wins, as is clear from the *Nairne* expert report that Defendants and Dr. Alford cite (ECF No. 249-2). Therefore, it was not necessary in that case to make this distinction in my expert reports or at trial.

Focus on Elections with Black Candidates in the Effectiveness Analysis. Dr. Alford notes in his report (for example, at page 2 and footnote 2 and page 5) that I focused on elections that included Black candidates in assessing effectiveness, whereas Dr. Alford considered “two-party contested statewide contests” from his selected election years, including contests where both candidates were White. Dr. Alford suggests these White-versus-White contests have “probative value” for the effectiveness analysis and that including them in the analysis is more “comprehensive.” I disagree that they should be included and explain why below.

For my effectiveness analysis during trial and in my March 14 remedial report, I analyzed all of the elections that are (1) racially polarized where (2) the candidate supported by Black voters is a Black candidate. While I have sometimes (as in this case) looked at White-versus-White elections in analyzing the existence of racially bloc voting, my usual practice for analyzing district effectiveness is to focus on elections that include Black candidates. I include only contests with Black-preferred Black candidates because, especially when voting is starkly racially polarized as it is in Mississippi, White candidates supported by Black voters may garner more White support (*i.e.*, more “crossover” support) than Black candidates supported by Black voters. My prior analyses in this case showed this is true in recent Mississippi elections: Jim Hood in 2019 and Brandon Presley in 2023 both received more White support than any of the Black-preferred Black candidates in these two statewide election years. As a consequence, the effectiveness scores produced by the effectiveness analysis will skew higher when White-versus-White contests are included. But Black voters do not really have an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice if the only candidates they can elect are White candidates; they must be able to elect Black candidates if those are the candidates they support. Examining only elections that include Black candidates avoids skewing the analysis and ensures that the analysis properly

identifies districts where Black voters are able to elect preferred candidates despite high levels of racially polarized voting even when those preferred candidates are Black.

The Choice of Election Years in Effectiveness Analysis. Dr. Alford in his report (for example, at pages 5 and 6 and 9) claims that in including only election contests from 2019 and 2023, he “focused on the more probative recent state office elections,” which he contrasts with my inclusion of electoral data from contests prior to 2019. I explain my decisions and confirm my results below.

In my original, trial-stage report, dated December 2023, my effectiveness analysis included all elections from 2011 to 2020 (as there were no statewide elections in 2021 and 2022) in which the Black-preferred candidate was Black. Since preparing my December 2023 report, the data for the 2023 and 2024 elections has been made available and I accordingly conducted a racial bloc voting analysis of those elections in my March 14 remedial report to confirm that voting in the areas of focus was still polarized. I then included the seven 2023 and 2024 election contests that included Black-preferred Black candidates in an updated effectiveness analysis. I did not remove any data from this analysis, both for the sake of consistency and because I do not think it is legitimate to simply ignore or discard data that I previously relied on.

Despite my belief that all of the data I included in the effectiveness analysis is appropriate, I have redone the effectiveness analysis removing the contests from the 2011 and 2012 elections (i.e., the oldest contests). Tables 1-3 below report the results of my effectiveness analysis relying only on the 2015 to 2024 election contests with Black-preferred Black candidates for the Remedial Senate Plan as well as Plaintiffs’ Senate Plans A and B. As a review of these tables makes clear, focusing only on elections that were held in the last ten years does not change the overall conclusion: Senate District 1 in the Remedial Plan does not provide Black voters with an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice when the elections in 2011 and 2012 are excluded. In fact, the effectiveness score decreases from .491 to .488. (The effectiveness score in Remedial District 11 increases from .502 to .509.) Senate District 1 (as well as District 11) in Plaintiffs’ Plan A and Plan B does provide Black voters with an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice.

Table 1: Functional Analysis of Remedial Senate Plan, 2015-2024 elections

Remedial State Senate Plan			
District	Percent Black	Effectiveness score	Percent Won score
1	52.5	.488	42.1
2	25.0	.341	0.0
10	29.3	.372	5.9
11	50.9	.509	64.7
19	24.0	.297	0.0

Table 2: Functional Analysis of Plaintiffs' Senate Plan A, 2015-2024 elections

Plaintiffs' State Senate Plan A			
District	Percent Black	Effectiveness score	Percent won score
1	57.2	.531	88.2
2	15.9	.247	0.0
10	29.4	.377	5.9
11	50.1	.517	82.4
19	29.2	.347	0.0

Table 3: Functional Analysis of Plaintiffs' Senate Plan B, 2015-2024 elections

Plaintiffs' State Senate Plan B			
District	Percent Black	Effectiveness score	Percent won score
1	57.1	.517	76.5
2	15.7	.254	0.0
10	28.6	.363	0.0
11	50.1	.517	82.4
19	31.3	.381	0.0

Similarly, conducting the effectiveness analysis to exclude the 2011 and 2012 elections also does not change my overall conclusion regarding the Remedial House Plan. House District

16 still fails to offer Black voters a realistic opportunity to elect their candidates of choice. The effectiveness score decreases from .503 to .501; the percent won score increases from 57.9% to 58.8%.

Table 4: Functional Analysis of Remedial House Plan, 2015-2024 elections

Remedial State House Plan			
District	Percent Black	Effectiveness score	Percent won score
16	53.2	.501	58.8
22	51.2	.526	82.4
36	54.6	.578	100.0
39	18.5	.246	0.0
41	64.6	.656	100.0

Table 5: Functional Analysis of Plaintiffs' House Plan A, 2015-2024 elections

Plaintiffs' State House Plan A			
District	Percent Black	Effectiveness score	Percent won score
16	56.0	.529	88.2
22	54.3	.550	94.1
36	54.6	.578	100.0
39	18.5	.246	0.0
41	64.6	.656	100.0

Table 6: Functional Analysis of Plaintiffs' House Plan B, 2015-2024 elections

Plaintiffs' State House Plan B			
District	Percent Black	Effectiveness score	Percent won score
16	57.4	.540	88.2
22	52.9	.553	94.1
36	55.4	.575	100.0
39	19.6	.235	0.0
41	55.6	.593	94.1

Dr. Alford's Effectiveness Analysis. Dr. Alford's effectiveness analysis is based only on the 2019 and 2023 statewide elections. Based on his analysis of all elections (including White-versus-White contests) in just those election years, he concludes (for example, on page 9, in discussing the Remedial Senate Plan) that the average vote share for Democratic candidates in the Black-majority districts in the Remedial Plans is over 50%, and that those districts "are effective districts for Black preferred candidates including those candidates that are Black."

After experimenting with including and excluding a variety of 2015 to 2024 election contests to analyze district effectiveness, I have concluded that the set of election contests relied on by Dr. Alford – only the 2019 and 2023 statewide contests, including those with no Black candidates – is the *only* data set that produces an effectiveness score of over .5 for Remedial Senate District 1 (although the percent won score is still under 50% even using Dr. Alford's chosen approach).

Table 7, below, provides the effectiveness scores for Remedial Senate District 1 using various different combinations of election contests that I explored.² The Appendix provides scores for all of the relevant Senate and House districts in the Remedial Plans and Plaintiffs' plans using these different combinations of elections.

² Because in all elections with a Black-preferred Black candidate the opposing candidate was White, I have labeled these elections as "biracial" in Table 7 and in the Appendix for ease of reading.

Table 7: Effectiveness Scores for Remedial Senate District 1 Using Different Combinations of Elections

Election Years	Candidates	Effectiveness Score	Percent Won
2015-2024	Biracial only (<i>Handley approach</i>)	0.488	41.2%
2015-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	0.494	41.4%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial only	0.485	33.3%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White	0.495	38.1%
2018-2024	Biracial only	0.496	50.0%
2018-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	0.499	45.5%
2019, 2023	Biracial only	0.496	44.4%
2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White (<i>Alford Approach</i>)	0.503	46.7%

Because White voters are more willing to vote for White candidates supported by Black voters than for Black candidates supported by Black voters, the effectiveness scores for the election combinations that include contests with only White candidates are always higher than the same combination of election years but without the election contests that include only White candidates. This is true not only for Remedial Senate District 1 but for every other district found in the Appendix.


Limiting the combination of elections to only the years of 2019 and 2023 produced the highest effectiveness scores of the combinations considered because White voters supported Jim Hood in the 2019 gubernatorial race and Brandon Presley in the 2023 gubernatorial election more than they supported any Black candidates. However, while it may be legitimate to focus on state legislative election years in assessing effectiveness, there is no legitimate reason to exclude the statewide elections in 2015 and limit the analysis to only two sets of elections. As Table 7 indicates, when the 2015 election contests are added, the effectiveness score for Remedial Senate District 1 decreases from .503 to .495 (or even lower, to .485, if considering only contests that included Black candidates from those years).

An Error in Dr. Alford's Report. Dr. Alford notes on page 9 of his report that “Dr. Handley’s data indicate that the average vote share for Black-preferred Black candidates in the elections from 2018 forward is 50.3%.” This is not, in fact, what my data indicates. As set forth in Table 7 above, for elections with Black-preferred candidates who were Black from 2018

forward, Remedial District 1's effectiveness score is .496 or 49.6%. What it appears Dr. Alford had to do to arrive at the figure 50.3% for elections with Black candidates since 2018 was to exclude three of the five federal election contests from that period (those conducted in 2020 and 2024) but include the two 2018 U.S. Senate contests in which Mike Espy ran. There is no legitimate reason to include some of these federal elections and not others.

Conclusion. My district-specific, functional analysis leads me to conclude that the Remedial Senate and House Plans continue to dilute the voting strength of Black voters in Mississippi. The Remedial Senate Plan includes an additional majority Black district but regardless of how an effectiveness analysis is conducted, it fails to provide Black voters with an equal opportunity to elect their candidates of choice, especially if Black voters wish to elect a Black representative to the State Senate. The Remedial House plan also offers an additional majority Black district but my analysis indicates that Black voters' ability to elect candidates of choice in Remedial House District 16 is marginal. Given that Black voters have virtually no chance of electing their candidates of choice in any of the majority White districts, providing Black voters with an equal opportunity to elect their candidates of choice to the state legislature requires drawing districts that provide Black voters with a realistic opportunity to elect their candidates of choice in areas where this is easily possible.

I reserve the right to amend or supplement my report considering additional facts, testimony and/or materials that may come to light. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct according to the best of my knowledge, information, and beliefs.



Dr. Lisa Handley

March 26, 2025

APPENDIX

Summary Effectiveness Table_House Plan A

Election Years	Candidates	House Plan A District 16		House Plan A District 22		House Plan A District 36	
		# of effectiveness contests score	# and % of contests won	effectiveness score	# and % of contests won	effectiveness score	# and % of contests won
2015-2024	Biracial only	17	0.529	15 88.2%	0.550	16 94.1%	0.578 100.0%
2015-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	29	0.533	25 86.2%	0.562	27 93.1%	0.584 100.0%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial only	12	0.523	10 83.3%	0.547	11 91.7%	0.574 100.0%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White	21	0.534	17 81.0%	0.565	19 90.5%	0.584 100.0%
2018-2024	Biracial only	14	0.544	14 100.0%	0.563	14 100.0%	0.585 100.0%
2018-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	22	0.547	22 100.0%	0.568	22 100.0%	0.585 100.0%
2019, 2023	Biracial only	9	0.546	9 100.0%	0.565	9 100.0%	0.584 100.0%
2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White	15	0.552	15 100.0%	0.575	15 100.0%	0.586 100.0%

Summary Effectiveness Table_House Plan A

Election Years	Candidates	House Plan A District 39		House Plan A District 41	
		# of effectiveness contests score	# and % of contests won	effectiveness score	# and % of contests won
2015-2024	Biracial only	17	0.246	0	0.656
			0.0%		100.0%
2015-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	29	0.257	0	0.658
			0.0%		100.0%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial only	12	0.247	0	0.641
			0.0%		100.0%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White	21	0.265	0	0.648
			0.0%		100.0%
2018-2024	Biracial only	14	0.255	0	0.666
			0.0%		100.0%
2018-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	22	0.262	0	0.665
			0.0%		100.0%
2019, 2023	Biracial only	9	0.262	0	0.652
			0.0%		100.0%
2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White	15	0.272	0	0.655
			0.0%		100.0%

Summary Effectiveness Table_House Plan B

Election Years	Candidates	House Plan B District 16		House Plan B District 22		House Plan B District 36	
		# of effectiveness contests score	# and % of contests won	effectiveness score	# and % of contests won	effectiveness score	# and % of contests won
2015-2024	Biracial only	17	0.540	15 88.2%	0.553 94.1%	0.575	17 100.0%
2015-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	29	0.546	25 86.2%	0.565 93.1%	0.581	29 100.0%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial only	12	0.535	10 83.3%	0.550 91.7%	0.570	12 100.0%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White	21	0.547	17 81.0%	0.568 90.5%	0.579	21 100.0%
2018-2024	Biracial only	14	0.555	14 100.0%	0.564 100.0%	0.581	14 100.0%
2018-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	22	0.558	22 100.0%	0.570 100.0%	0.580	22 100.0%
2019, 2023	Biracial only	9	0.558	9 100.0%	0.567 100.0%	0.577	9 100.0%
2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White	15	0.564	15 100.0%	0.576 100.0%	0.580	15 100.0%

Summary Effectiveness Table_House Plan B

Election Years	Candidates	House Plan B District 39		House Plan B District 41	
		# of effectiveness contests score	# and % of contests won	effectiveness score	# and % of contests won
2015-2024	Biracial only	17	0.235	0 0.0%	16 94.1%
2015-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	29	0.248	0 0.0%	28 96.6%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial only	12	0.233	0 0.0%	11 91.7%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White	21	0.253	0 0.0%	20 95.2%
2018-2024	Biracial only	14	0.239	0 0.0%	14 100.0%
2018-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	22	0.245	0 0.0%	22 100.0%
2019, 2023	Biracial only	9	0.238	0 0.0%	9 100.0%
2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White	15	0.249	0 0.0%	15 100.0%

Summary Effectiveness Table_House Remedial

Election Years	Candidates	House Remedy District 16		House Remedy District 22		House Remedy District 36		
		# of	effectiveness	# and % of	effectiveness	# and % of	effectiveness	# and % of
		contests	score	contests won	score	contests won	score	contests won
2015-2024	Biracial only	17	0.501	10 58.8%	0.526	14 82.4%	0.578	17 100.0%
2015-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	29	0.507	17 58.6%	0.539	23 79.3%	0.584	29 100.0%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial only	12	0.496	7 58.3%	0.523	10 83.3%	0.574	12 100.0%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White	21	0.508	12 57.1%	0.543	17 81.0%	0.584	21 100.0%
2018-2024	Biracial only	14	0.515	10 71.4%	0.538	13 92.9%	0.585	14 100.0%
2018-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	22	0.518	15 68.2%	0.543	20 90.9%	0.585	22 100.0%
2019, 2023	Biracial only	9	0.517	7 77.8%	0.540	9 100.0%	0.584	9 100.0%
2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White	15	0.524	11 73.3%	0.551	15 100.0%	0.586	15 100.0%

Summary Effectiveness Table_House Remedial

Election Years	Candidates	House Remedy District 39		House Remedy District 41	
		# of effectiveness contests score	# and % of contests won	effectiveness score	# and % of contests won
2015-2024	Biracial only	17	0.246	0	0.656
			0.0%		100.0%
2015-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	29	0.257	0	0.658
			0.0%		100.0%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial only	12	0.247	0	0.641
			0.0%		100.0%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White	21	0.265	0	0.648
			0.0%		100.0%
2018-2024	Biracial only	14	0.255	0	0.666
			0.0%		100.0%
2018-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	22	0.262	0	0.665
			0.0%		100.0%
2019, 2023	Biracial only	9	0.262	0	0.652
			0.0%		100.0%
2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White	15	0.272	0	0.655
			0.0%		100.0%

Summary Effectiveness Table_Senate Plan A

Election Years	Candidates	Senate Plan A District 1		Senate Plan A District 2		Senate Plan A District 10	
		# of effectiveness contests score	# and % of contests won	effectiveness score	# and % of contests won	effectiveness score	# and % of contests won
2015-2024	Biracial only	17	0.531	15	0.247	0	0.377
				88.2%		0.0%	5.9%
2015-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	29	0.537	26	0.248	0	0.383
				89.7%		0.0%	6.9%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial only	12	0.522	11	0.233	0	0.371
				91.7%		0.0%	0.0%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White	21	0.533	19	0.242	0	0.383
				90.5%		0.0%	4.8%
2018-2024	Biracial only	14	0.540	13	0.265	0	0.379
				92.9%		0.0%	7.1%
2018-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	22	0.541	21	0.267	0	0.381
				95.5%		0.0%	4.5%
2019, 2023	Biracial only	9	0.533	9	0.257	0	0.373
				100.0%		0.0%	0.0%
2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White	15	0.539	15	0.266	0	0.379
				100.0%		0.0%	0.0%

Summary Effectiveness Table_Senate Plan A

Election Years	Candidates	Senate Plan A District 11		Senate Plan A District 19	
		# of effectiveness contests score	# and % of contests won	effectiveness score	# and % of contests won
2015-2024	Biracial only	17	0.517	14 82.4%	0 0.0%
2015-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	29	0.512	23 79.3%	0 0.0%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial only	12	0.496	9 75.0%	0 0.0%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White	21	0.497	15 71.4%	0 0.0%
2018-2024	Biracial only	14	0.548	14 100.0%	0 0.0%
2018-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	22	0.547	22 100.0%	0 0.0%
2019, 2023	Biracial only	9	0.539	9 100.0%	0 0.0%
2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White	15	0.541	15 100.0%	0 0.0%

Summary Effectiveness Table_Senate Plan B

Election Years	Candidates	Senate Plan B District 1		Senate Plan B District 2		Senate Plan B District 10		
		# of	effectiveness	# and % of	effectiveness	# and % of	effectiveness	# and % of
		contests	score	contests won	score	contests won	score	contests won
2015-2024	Biracial only	17	0.517	13 76.5%	0.254	0 0.0%	0.363	0 0.0%
2015-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	29	0.524	24 82.8%	0.255	0 0.0%	0.372	1 3.4%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial only	12	0.510	10 83.3%	0.240	0 0.0%	0.360	0 0.0%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White	21	0.521	18 85.7%	0.248	0 0.0%	0.373	1 4.8%
2018-2024	Biracial only	14	0.527	11 78.6%	0.274	0 0.0%	0.360	0 0.0%
2018-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	22	0.529	19 86.4%	0.276	0 0.0%	0.362	0 0.0%
2019, 2023	Biracial only	9	0.522	8 88.9%	0.266	0 0.0%	0.354	0 0.0%
2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White	15	0.528	14 93.3%	0.274	0 0.0%	0.360	0 0.0%

Summary Effectiveness Table_Senate Plan B

Election Years	Candidates	Senate Plan B District 11		Senate Plan B District 19	
		# of effectiveness contests score	# and % of contests won	effectiveness score	# and % of contests won
2015-2024	Biracial only	17	0.517	14 82.4%	0 0.0%
2015-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	29	0.512	23 79.3%	0 0.0%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial only	12	0.496	9 75.0%	0 0.0%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White	21	0.497	15 71.4%	0 0.0%
2018-2024	Biracial only	14	0.548	14 100.0%	0 0.0%
2018-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	22	0.547	22 100.0%	0 0.0%
2019, 2023	Biracial only	9	0.539	9 100.0%	0 0.0%
2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White	15	0.541	15 100.0%	0 0.0%

Summary Effectiveness Table_Senate Remedial

Election Years	Candidates	Senate Remedy District 1			Senate Remedy District 2		Senate Remedy District 10	
		# of	effectiveness	# and % of	effectiveness	# and % of	effectiveness	# and % of
		contests	score	contests won	score	contests won	score	contests won
2015-2024	Biracial only	17	0.488	7 41.2%	0.341	0 0.0%	0.372	1 5.9%
2015-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	29	0.494	12 41.4%	0.337	0 0.0%	0.382	2 6.9%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial only	12	0.485	4 33.3%	0.321	0 0.0%	0.368	0 0.0%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White	21	0.495	8 38.1%	0.324	0 0.0%	0.382	1 4.8%
2018-2024	Biracial only	14	0.496	7 50.0%	0.371	0 0.0%	0.371	1 7.1%
2018-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	22	0.499	10 45.5%	0.370	0 0.0%	0.374	1 4.5%
2019, 2023	Biracial only	9	0.496	4 44.4%	0.361	0 0.0%	0.365	0 0.0%
2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White	15	0.503	7 46.7%	0.365	0 0.0%	0.372	0 0.0%

Summary Effectiveness Table_Senate Remedial

Election Years	Candidates	Senate Remedy District 11		Senate Remedy District 19	
		# of effectiveness contests score	# and % of contests won	effectiveness score	# and % of contests won
2015-2024	Biracial only	17	0.509	11 64.7%	0 0.0%
2015-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	29	0.505	17 58.6%	0 0.0%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial only	12	0.490	6 50.0%	0 0.0%
2015, 2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White	21	0.491	10 47.6%	0 0.0%
2018-2024	Biracial only	14	0.540	11 78.6%	0 0.0%
2018-2024	Biracial and White-versus-White	22	0.538	17 77.3%	0 0.0%
2019, 2023	Biracial only	9	0.531	6 66.7%	0 0.0%
2019, 2023	Biracial and White-versus-White	15	0.533	10 66.7%	0 0.0%